America's Only Monthly Revisionist Newsletter

Smith's Report

ON THE HOLOCAUST CONTROVERSY

Number 78 WWW.CODOH.COM March 2001

The Beirut Conference: Catalyst of Controversy

George Brewer

The announcement last December of a major revisionist conference to be held at the end of March 2001 in Beirut, Lebanon brought forth the typical howls of rage from the usual anti-revisionist sources. To that extent, the conference, even in its planning stages, had performed an important service in publicizing revisionism. At the same time, the conference created a linkage between revisionist historiography on the one hand and anti-Zionism on the other. In turn, this linkage deserves careful examination, because of a number of pitfalls that seem inherent in the approach.

In the event, just a week before it was scheduled to begin, the conference was cancelled by what passes for the government in Lebanon. Still, in our view, the conference was successful in exposing the dynamics of the Holocaust and the current Middle East situation.

BACKGROUND

The conference was first announced last December in a press release by the Institute for Historical Review (IHR), which stated that the conference would be put on by the Swiss group *Verite et Jusice* (Truth and Justice) with the help of IHR.

The actual purpose of the conference first became clear in January, through an article by the Swiss revisionist Juergen Graf, now in exile in Iran, who appeared to be the prime mover behind the conference. The article, a brief but cogent review of the Holocaust in modern politics, essentially argued that the Holocaust was used to justify the Zionist presence in Palestine (i.e., Israel

Continued on Page 3

LETTERS

I look forward to your observations regarding Smith's Report *and the issues it addresses. I read everything you write. Oftentimes it influences how I handle the work. Unfortunately, I can not reply to correspondence. I don't have enough hours in the day. I have space to print a very small number of your letters. If you do not want your name published in* **SR**, *please make that plain. Thanks.*

Instead of bashing John Sack and Esquire, look on the *positive* side. A first-ever of its kind of article in a monthly with a print run of 700,000 copies. A generally positive treatment by John Sack of our humanity and good will and our warm reception of him at the IHR. A rather positive treatment of me and my wife Elda [remember, he was our house guest for two nights several years ago and I introduced him to revisionism—and even got David Cole to fly out for the weekend to talk about revisionism to Sack.

John left here a different person. He followed my suggestion about going to the IHR, met Mark Weber for lunch and got the tour of the facility etc. Ever since then, John has been trying to get his article published in *Esquire* or the *Village Voice*. John writes from a journalist's perspective and, additionally, as a true believer in the 6M story—but at least he is sincere and not a scam artist like Wiesel and Lipstadt. He presented my teaching of Butz at U Alabama-Huntsville in 1987 positively. That was a first of its kind and has not been duplicated since. The sidebar across from my photo was pretty accurate.

John makes clear in the article that there are items in the Holo-story that we deny that really *ought to be denied*. Hence, why not write that Sack effectively makes holocaust denial acceptable?

I could go on, but let me say only that instead of picking at the Provan photo (an embarrassment to Provan as well -- we have discussed what he should and should *not* have done when the photographer asked for a tour of his premises!), why not emphasize the positive? I like you await the April issue of *Esquire*. to see what letters, if any, will be printed. So, the bottom line is *not* to complain, but to look for the best elements in this amazing article.

Robert H. Countess, Ph.D.

Esquire *published three letter regarding Sack's article, each condemning revisionists.*

Have not heard from you for awhile. Hope you are still functioning. Your work is crucial to the survival of Western civilization.

JZ, Texas

Your letter and the February issue of ***SR*** *crossed in the mail. There are family problems (see Notebook) but I'm okay. So long as men like George Brewer, Richard Widmann, David Thomas and others continue to associate with me, and so long as I continue to receive the support of individuals like you, the work will continue to grow.*

Henry Fenton's idea in **SR** 77 about organizing Catholic revisionist activists is the best idea since I don't know when.

We old people (I'm 75) are only telling one-another what we already know about the Mid East, the holocaust, etc., and we are not going to do anything except take our knowledge to our graves. To ever be able to change things we must first create a critical mass of people educated as to the true facts concerning such issues. This "critical mass" is in our colleges. So doesn't it makes sense for us to "come out" and openly endorse Open Debate on the Holocaust – especially to college students?

Please pass my name and address on to Mr. Fenton.

Garland Clifton, WDC

I very much agree with you about where the "critical mass" waits to be awakened. That's why I believe the Campus Project is so important. I have forwarded your name to Mr. Fenton.

An interesting use of the word "Sonderbehandlung" occurs in a letter written by President von Hindenburg to Reichschancellor Hitler on 7 April 1933 protesting against measures taken to deprive Jewish civil servants of their offices. The letter reads in part,

"Nach meinem Empfinden müssen Beamte, Richter, Lehrer und Rechtsanwälte, die kriegsbeschädigt oder Frontsoldaten oder Söhne von Kriegsgefallenen sind oder selbst Söhne im Felde verloren haben -- soweit sie in ihrer Person keinen Grund zu einer Sonderbehandlung geben -- im Dienste belassen werden. Wenn sie wert waren, für Deutschland zu kämpfen und zu bluten, sollen sie auch als würdig angesehen werden, dem Vaterlande in ihren Berufe weiter zu dienen."

Translation: "In my opinion, officials, judges, teachers, and lawyers, who were wounded or were soldiers on the front or who are the sons of men killed in the war or who themselves lost sons in the field—insofar as they give rise to no special treatment (*sonderbehandlung*) in their person—should be left in their offices. If they were valuable enough to fight and bleed for Germany, they should be considered worthy of continuing to serve the Fatherland in their professions."

Source: *VERHEIMLICHTE DOKUMENTE*, edited by Erich Kern, p.140, available from the FZ- Verlag, GmbH, Paosostrasse 2, 8000 Munich 60.

Carlos Whitlock Porter

[Below is a recent addition to Lou Rollins' book *Lucifer's Lexicon*.]

Oxymoron, n. A contradiction in terms, such as: humanitarian intervention, dry wine, Black Studies, Christian Science, social justice, compassionate conservatism, Liberation Theology, soft rock, computer literacy, journalistic ethics, modern art.

Lou Rollins

Continued from Page 1

and the Occupied Territories), and that if the received history of the Holocaust were shown to be false the Jewish state would collapse. We will touch on some of the arguments Graf made a bit further on in this article.

PREDICTABLE RESPONSES

For the first few weeks there was no response to the conference planning. Suddenly, in the beginning of February, a number of Jewish groups emerged to condemn the conference, moved to have it canceled, and, in the process, spewed out a number of misrepresentations and half-baked conspiracy theories about revisionism.

The first squawk came from the Anti-Defamation League, its director, Abe Foxman, flush with victory after having helped secure a pardon for the Jewish American felon and fugitive from justice, Marc Rich. On February 11, Foxman announced that the "Holocaust deniers" were moving their "drumbeat of antisemitism" to the Middle East, and that there was a "change in strategy" among "deniers" who were now trying to find an audience for their views in the morass of Middle East turmoil. As if to make the charges more serious, the press release went on to say that "Anti-semitism and racial theories" had long held sway among radical Arabs.

Foxman's remarks were devious in more than one respect. In the first place, the conference did not stem from a "change of strategy," but was clearly planned as a result of the fact that one of the most prominent of revisionists—Graf himself—had sought refuge in the Arab world from persecution in Switzerland. Second, to argue that Arabs were concerned with "Anti-semitism and racial theories" is a transparent falsehood designed to associate the Arab world with western anti-Jewish attitudes and racial problems. Moreover, the association cannot withstand the barest scrutiny, since the Islamic world has never been concerned with race, and fosters anti-Jewish feeling not on the basis of "racial theory" but simply because most Arabs feel that Israel occupies land that is rightfully theirs.

The ADL press release was followed the next day by the Simon Wiesenthal Center, whose associate dean, Rabbi Abraham Cooper, announced that a request had been filed with the Swiss government to see if anything could be done to stop the activities of "Truth and Justice." Here, for the first time, was an indication that strong-arm tactics were being employed.

The low point in the first wave of negative reactions was achieved by the *Canadian Jewish News*, which ran an article on February 22. Heavily quoting Stephen Emerson, a hack journalist who has created for himself a reputation as a terrorism expert, the article claimed that the scheduled conference was just "the tip of the iceberg" of the "ongoing collaboration" between "Neo-Nazi fundamentalists" and "Middle Eastern terror groups."

Of course there is not a shred of truth to any of these charges, but it conjured up a useful image of all-powerful revisionists conniving with terrorists in order to tear down, or perhaps blow up, Israel and whatever else remains of Western civilization. The same day the *Canadian Jewish News* article appeared the World Jewish Congress made a public plea to the Lebanese government to stop the conference.

A few weeks later, on March 8, Rabbi Cooper again was in the news, this time in an Op-Ed piece in *USA Today*. Once again, we had the typical assertion that anyone raising questions about the Holocaust "defames the memory of the dead" and that such questioning inevitably will lead to a "resurgence of Nazism." The novelty of the Op-Ed piece was that Rabbi Cooper introduced his article with a spiteful attack on Jewish author John Sack, whose *Esquire* article of the previous month generally portraying revisionists as "harmless Germanophiles" was apparently too fair for Rabbi Cooper's liking. The day after Rabbi Cooper's article was published, the South African Board of Jewish Deputies announced that they too were calling on the Lebanese government to cancel the "hate crimes" the conference would represent.

CHANGING SIDES

In the second week of March an unusual shift took place. An Israeli Jewish journalist published a series of articles highly critical of the attempts to scuttle the conference, as well as of Israeli oppression of Palestinians. At the same time, a number of prominent Palestinians issued statements distancing themselves from the conference.

Israel Shamir is a Russian born Jew who writes left-wing commentary on the political scene in Israel. In March, he wrote a series of columns, which outlined what he considers to be the main problems in the area, particularly emphasizing what he considers the quasi-genocidal policies of the Israeli government towards the Palestinians. In one column, entitled "Vampire Killers," he discussed the hypocrisy of the Jewish establishment in attempting to halt the Beirut conference. At the same time, he came as close as an Israeli journalist can to accepting the validity of some revisionist claims. However, for all that, he concluded, "The arguments on gas chambers and soap production could be very interesting, but they are quite irrelevant." Shamir considers them irrelevant because he concluded that even without them the sate of Israel would simply find some other pretext to continue its anti-Palestinian acts. We will discuss this in more detail below, but the important thing about Shamir's writings is that revisionism was defended by a freethinking Israeli Jew—much to the delight of revisionists worldwide.

Two days later another dramatic shift took place in which 14 leading Arab intellectuals signed a letter in the Paris newspaper *Le Monde* condemning the conference. The signatories were illustrious, including Edward Said, longtime Israeli nemesis. Another of the signatories, Joseph Samaha, was quoted as saying that he opposed the conference because it might suggest that "the defensive Arab

struggle against Israel and its allies is somehow the extension of the Nazi extermination plan."

What were these people thinking? Samaha's remark suggests that he was frightened of the Nazi-Arab conspiracy theory that is frequently peddled, as it was described in the *Canadian Jewish News* article above. Apparently, these Arab intellectuals decided that it was better for their purposes if there was no association between them and Holocaust revisionism. Yet such a gesture, which implicitly endorses the standard Holocaust story, does not come free. There is little doubt that these Arabs expected, and still expect, something in return, and something more substantial than the guarded praise of a handful of Jewish mouthpieces. Our guess is that the public relations gesture by these 14 Arab intellectuals, which betrayed the basis of their intellectual lives, was made in the expectation that the Israelis would translate that concession into meaningful rollbacks in their treatment of the Palestinian population. However, if that was their expectation, our prediction is that they will be disappointed in the outcome.

DILEMMAS

The switcheroo acted out by Israel Shamir and the Arab intellectuals clearly showed how the very idea of the revisionist conference had energized the situation in the Middle East. At the same time, these unpredictable reactions remind us of the volatility of the situation in the region. At this point we should step back and comment briefly on some of the aims of the conference.

For example, it has been said that the Holocaust is a religion, and its function is to support the state of Israel and denigrate and blackmail Germany. There's a lot of truth to this, but revisionists should keep in mind that there's a difference between what the Holocaust has come to represent in political discourse and the actual factual errors that comprise it. To put it another way, the basic idea of the Holocaust is that the Jewish people were persecuted and killed by Germany while the rest of the world stood by and did nothing. This basic idea may be wrong in many of its particulars, including gas chambers, six million, and an extermination plan. It may even be wrong in terms of the claim that "the rest of the world did nothing" to help. But every informed and unprejudiced person accepts the fact that Jews were persecuted by the Nazi government of Germany, and that at least hundreds of thousands died.

The real issue, from the point of view of contemporary politics, is not: What are the facts of the Holocaust? The issue is that regardless of the facts, the Holocaust story is used to procure wealth, reparations, and foreign aid, and is also used to bolster Israeli identity and the occupation of land heavily populated by non-Jews.

One can say that Germany and other countries should stop feeling guilty about whatever happened in World War Two, and should stop paying. Fine. But one could just as easily say that even if six million Jews had actually been killed in gas chambers. The proof of this is that over the past two years a number of voices have been raised which are critical of the exploitation of the Holocaust story for economic or political purposes, including Peter Novick, Norman Finkelstein, and, as noted above, Israel Shamir. All Jews, none of these authors has attempted to couple their criticism of the Holocaust as an idea with any questioning of the usual Holocaust "facts." To put it another way, the political leverage of the Holocaust—pro-Israel, anti-German and anti-Arab—may be colored by falsehoods, but it does not depend on those falsehoods.

It seems to us that Israel Shamir is largely right: the use of the Holocaust to support Israeli policies is a reflection of existing power relations, not the other way around. The Holocaust as an idea never would have succeeded if it had contradicted powerful material interests. In 1945, and for decades thereafter, the Holocaust was a useful tool to many. To the United States in justifying international intervention. To the Soviet Union in justifying the occupation of Eastern Europe. To most Europeans to justify the limits placed on postwar Germany, and to all of the allies in absolving them of any guilt feelings for the wartime and postwar treatment of the German people.

To be sure, Jews also exploited the story: but they were neither the first nor the most powerful. The paradox is that over the past twenty years, as communism weakened in Eastern Europe only to collapse in the early 1990's, the idea of fantastic Nazi exterminations has weakened, because it serves no purpose. Meanwhile, the idea has flourished in the United States, which uses it to justify race-based social policies as well as foreign intervention, and of course it continues to flourish in Israel for obvious reasons.

Ralph Waldo Emerson used to say: "Things are in the saddle, and ride mankind." To the extent that revisionists are driven by a desire to change the existing power relations in the Middle East, they should focus on those matters, along with their Jewish and Israeli colleagues. In such a context, the existence or non-existence of gas chambers sixty years ago is not crucial.

On the other hand, for those revisionists who are most concerned with the abuse and fabrication of the historical record, they should continue to expose the falsehoods on which the current World War Two narrative is based. But they should have no illusions about the upshot of their endeavors. The desire to write the history of the past as it occurred is an important undertaking, one in which revisionists have made many notable contributions. But the end result of that undertaking will be only historical truth, not a revolution in the world's power relationships. For many of us, the attempt to get at the historical truth is important in and of itself.

The idea that exposing the falsehoods of the Holocaust will lead to the destruction of Israel is, in our view, apocalyptic. We might further ask to what extent we, as Westerners, would approve of that destruction, and what would ensue.

The Israel Shamir solution—"one man, one vote"—strikes us as naïve. By this path of absolute democracy, two longstanding South African Western cultures, in the Union of South Africa and Rhodesia, have been largely crippled, and the situation appears to be getting worse. To be sure, in the abstract, people should never be discriminated against on the basis of race and everyone should have a say in how their country is governed. But the historical record shows that when previously disenfranchised groups are empowered, the first thing that such democracy brings is the attempt to democratize wealth, with all that that entails in terms of wealth and land seizures, social and political chaos, charismatic dictators, police states and ultimately mass killings. We may say that these are necessary steps that nations have to go through to rectify injustices or to further their development, and that they are in any case better than the previous oppression. Perhaps: yet to invite such chaos is to our minds questionable.

We also have to bear in mind, as revisionists, that our devotion to historical truth is coupled to a strong belief in individualism and the right to free intellectual inquiry. Do we really see these things in the Arab world? We can avoid discussing the semi-feudal infrastructure of most Arab states, the suppression of dissent, the forms of punishment by mutilation that are routinely carried out. None but the most Diversity-besotted persons would regard these things are merely "relative."

We cannot avoid the fact that in several Arab states there is a commitment to a single view of reality that is at times enforced to unreal extremes. Just in the past month, the Islamic fundamentalist government of Afghanistan, in an effort to enforce a unified vision of reality, ordered the destruction of hundreds of Buddha statues simply because their existence violated their view of the Koran. To be sure, this lunatic endeavor to destroy potentially dangerous symbols could be compared to the over zealous campaigns of some Jewish groups who apparently will not be satisfied until every swastika on the face of the earth is destroyed. But we would not want to affiliate ourselves with one totalitarian vision of the world just to break the hold of another. In our view, revisionists, by their nature, should remain free agents.

CONCLUSIONS

The fact that the revisionist conference in Beirut was cancelled is not a cause for celebration.

Still, the very idea of the conference yielded several important points. First, it has led the Palestinians and other Arabs to make an ideological concession in advance, one where they join in the suppression of Holocaust revisionism in return for a nebulous promise of self-government in Palestine. They will soon be disappointed at the response of the Israeli government of Ariel Sharon. Second, having discovered the potency of the Holocaust story as an ideological weapon, they will no doubt return to it after their future disappointment. Third, the cancellation has allowed revisionists to make the point that the Holocaust is a fundamental prop for Zionism, even if the Jewish state is not likely to collapse without it. At the same time the cancellation has also allowed revisionists to stay above the political fray in the Middle East, and avoid an ideological commitment themselves, in this case, to possible Islamic militants or fundamentalists.

There is one further positive aspect to this cancellation. It is to demonstrate once and for all the enormous power of the mostly Jewish groups—the ADL, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, the World Jewish Congress, and others—who opposed the conference. By their press releases and articles, the cancellation also shows the willingness of these same groups to engage in the most demagogic rhetoric in order to achieve their goals. Once again it has been demonstrated how these groups will betray the basic ideas of intellectual freedom on which our Western civilization was built for the sake of even short-term political gain.

While revisionists would form an uneasy alliance with fundamentalists of any kind, Islamic or otherwise, it appears these same Jewish groups would be right at home with them. While Islamic fundamentalists blow up priceless archaeological relics in order to police how their people think, the ADL and its clones in the Jewish community are so far content to spare the relics, and concentrate on controlling how the rest of us think. If successful, such tactics will make intellectual freedom itself a relic. Revisionists are playing a central role in an international effort to see to it that this will never come about.

NOTEBOOK

Bradley R. Smith

Mailed the February issue of *Smith's Report* on 10 March. Will have the March issue out before the end of March, picking up about ten days, on my printing schedule, maybe more. From that perspective I'm ahead of the game. The fact is, I am six weeks behind schedule. There are many reasons why I got behind. A sudden move from Baja with nothing more than my computers, a few files and documents, two suitcases and my daughter. I'm an autobiographer so I want to tell you exactly what those reasons are. You might respond that this is not the right forum. Maybe you would be right.

CODOHWeb is holding very steady through this slowdown, proof that it has become an international resource for revisionism, as any great archive is. During the four weeks leading up to the week ending 24 March, total weekly accesses to documents on the site have numbered from 140,340 to 178, 443. And that's without any significant achievement on my part with the Campus Project. We have become part

of the mainstream. We're not in the center of it, but we *are* there.

On 18 February the ***London Daily Telegraph***, in a story about the publication in German of Norman Finkelstein's *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*, reported that:

> *A book accusing American Jews of using the Nazi Holocaust to blackmail Europe into making huge "exploitative" compensation payments has sold more than 50,000 copies in Germany following its publication here two weeks ago.*
>
> *Finkelstein's promotional tour of Germany has attracted large audiences. A launch of his book at Berlin's Urania theatre was attended by more than 1,000 people. The weekly magazine* Der Spiegel *said: "Germany is in the grip of Holocaust madness. Finkelstein is being taken seriously. What he says corresponds with what many who do not know the facts think."*
>
> *Publication of his book coincided with an opinion poll that showed that 65 per cent of Germans totally or partially agreed with Finkelstein's assertion that "Jewish organizations make exaggerated compensation demands on Germany to enrich themselves".*

It's good that Germans have a growing awareness of this fact. When Germans begin to question the story, that's when the worm will really turn. I have always argued that we need Jews in revisionism. I still do. But we need Germans even more. That's what the Holocaust story is all about. It's not a story about Jews. It's about Germans and Jews together, forever.

Germar Rudolf has written a 3,500-word article on Finkelstein's *Holocaust Industry* and posted it on his Website. David Thomas posted the article on the CODOH bulletin board so that CODOHWeb readers can participate in some back and forth on the matter.

Rudolf has many interesting observations to make about Finkelstein's *Industry* from the perspective of a European, rather than an American. He addresses interesting complexities involving Finkelstein, Daniel J. Goldhagan, and Rudolf himself.

> [*If you'd like to read Germar Rudolf's article on the Finkelstein book, I'll send it along in return for a small contribution.*]

April is Holocaust remembrance month. I will have no advertisement circulating this April for the first time in ten years. I'm all right with that. What would come of it? A few more scandals on a few more campuses. I've done that. I've made too many scandals on too many campuses for too many years. No way to keep up with them. One scandal on one important campus, where I follow it out to the end, capitalize on it thoroughly, would be more productive than the last fifty scandals I have created where I have been too busy to capitalize on any one of them.

I have gone over this again and again. I rethought the Project during the winter and wrote about it here. I would do opinion pieces rather than advertisements. Ten opinion pieces each academic year rather than one advertisement. But then things went bad with my daughter and I had to pull up stakes and leave Mexico.

This morning the alarm rang at 6:45 as usual. Paloma and I were in our sleeping bags on the floor in the empty living room. I woke her, got up and made her a cup of raspberry flavored instant coffee. She sat up against the wall and drank it sleepily. Then she went to her empty bedroom and started getting ready for school. I cranked up the computer and took care of my email. I'm back on the Internet with a permanent email address, I'm in touch with Thomas, Widmann and Brewer, the guys who manage CODOHWeb and keep me on the straight and narrow. I'm the oldest in the group – by far -- but I welcome their help staying on the straight and narrow. Then it was time to drive Paloma to her new high school where she is a freshman. She went out the front door carrying her backpack in one hand and an apple in the other. The emptiness of the apartment, with her not in it, washed through me like a hollow wave.

David Horowitz is running an advertisement in campus newspapers titled "10 Reasons Why Reparations for Blacks Is a Bad Idea for Blacks—and Racist Too". Horowitz is a 1960s radical leftist (he was a member of the Black Panthers) who took a hard turn to the right in the 1980s. In the *Washington Post* (5 March) Jonathan Yardley quotes Horowitz as saying "… this is the only way I could get my message heard on campus."

Sounds familiar.

The running of the Horowitz ad is causing a great scandal. Protests, entire issues of newspapers stolen, demands that editors resign, that the money accepted fro the ad be donated to the "Third World community." All of it sounds familiar. Been there, done that.

Richard Widmann was the first to bring to my attention the hullabaloo on those campuses where the student paper has run Horowitz's ad. Widmann suggests that perhaps Horowitz is taking a page out of the successes of CODOH's Campus Project. Who knows? But Horowitz has been getting a free copy of ***Smith's Report*** for four or five years. He knows all about CODOH's Campus Project.

Eric Zorn reports in the *Chicago Tribune* (22 March) that in the past month, activists at five major colleges have "fallen" for David Horowitz's sucker punch, while student newspaper editors at another 25 universities have clumsily opened themselves up for this "roundhouse from the right."

Zorn encourages a free press in this article about Horowitz. A few years ago when I ran a full-page ad in the *Daily Northwestern* urging an open debate on the Holocaust Controversy, it was another story. Zorn interviewed me by telephone, was rather uppity, and when he published his column there was not a word in it that

encouraged an open debate on anything.

Horowitz will get some real mileage out of his ad. Good for him. I submit that if he does others he will get increasingly less mileage from those. That's the way it works.

Abraham Foxman, maximum leader of the Anti-Defamation League, ostensibly concerned about the Horowitz affair, wrote to the *New York Times* (23 March):

> *For years, anti-Semites have sought to influence young minds on campus with advertisements that deny that the Holocaust happened. Despite having no basis in historical fact, these offensive ads have been accepted by many campus newspaper editors on the assumption that the First Amendment allows no alternative.*

I am the only one who has run such ads "for years." I very much regret that Abraham believes that I don't like him because he's Jewish. He does annoy me, but it's because he is an outrage against intellectual freedom, not because he's Jewish.

Meanwhile, we have just found out, from William Safire at the *Washington Post* no less, that Abe has been caught with his hand in the wrong cookie jar.

> *The purchase of a pardon by Marc Rich haunts the Senate this week. The stain spreads; now we learn that the fugitive billionaire, with $250,000 to the Anti-Defamation League, induced its national director to lobby President Bill Clinton for forgiveness and thereby bring glee to the hearts of anti-Semites.* Abe Foxman should resign to demonstrate that ethical blindness has consequences."

It takes money for these guys to nose out ethical blindness. They don't understand very well that it is ethically blind to suppress and censor intellectual freedom. It is ethically blind because the suppression and censorship of what others think can only be effected through the initiation of force.

Shawna VanNess, past editor-in-chief of the Hofstra University *Chronicle*, is working on a senior project surrounding the issues and media coverage in the fall of 1999 raised by the staff's decision to distribute *The Revisionist* in some 5,000 copies of the *Chronicle*. She was stalwart in defending the paper's good judgement when it distributed **TR**. I do not give telephone interviews any longer, something always goes wrong, but that's what VanNess wants. I'll do it for her. She deserves it.

Arthur Butz, author of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, alerted some of us to an open letter that was emailed (23 March) to President Henry S. Bienen of Northwestern University, where Butz is a tenured professor. The letter was sent to faculty in the history department as well. The author of the open letter is by a Chuck Peterka, whom none of us knows. His letter is excerpted from an article published by a Alan November [sic].

Briefly, the letter is yet one more assault on Professor Butz, demanding that his Website be disassociated from the "domain" name of Northwestern University -- < nwu.edu >. Its angle is to tell a story about a fourteen-year-old student named Zack, who is not identified in any other way.

> *One day Zack was asked by his retired neighbor what he was learning in school. Zack answered, 'I'm working on a history paper about how the Holocaust never happened.' The neighbor was incredulous. 'Zack, where did you hear that the Holocaust didn't happen?' 'I found it on the Internet in my high school library. Concentration camps were really clinics to help the Jews fight typhus carried by lice....'*

Not quite the argument that Butz makes, but there you have the danger of the Internet and the World Wide Web for the Holocaust Industry.

> *Look at Professor Butz's posting from the perspective of a fourteen-year-old untrained to think critically about information. [Butz's] page is simple and clear. It's written in a calm, logical tone. From Zack's perspective, it's a valid source from a tenured professor at a top university. It has a publication date in the 1990s. It's on the Internet. It must be 'true.'*

As the letter writer points out, Butz's article is "a persuasive document and it has the domain name of nwu.edu, Northwestern University." There are tens of thousands of "Zacks" in our high schools who are going to "come across" revisionism on the Internet. They are already accessing revisionist documents on CODOHweb alone at the rate of 700,000-plus per month. Most of our Zacks will not volunteer to their neighbors what they have found until they are satisfied that there is something to it.

As noted above, the original article upon which Peterka based his letter to NWU President Bienen was written by one Alan November. The bias of November's article and his ignorance of Butz and revisionist theory are obvious. November argues that if the "links" in Butz's article on his Webpage are followed out they will show that there are "two broad categories of related sites: *hate mongers and hate watchers* (my emphasis).

Alan November is a senior partner at Educational Renaissance Planners. He is an internationally known educational technology leader (according to A.N.). The article itself was published in *Technology and Learning Magazine*. It is adapted from a forthcoming book titled *Educating Students for a Digital World*. TLM in turn is published by an Internet group called The Well-Connected Educator, whose director is Gwen Solomon. WCE in turn is a subsidiary of a huge international Internet conglomerate based in San Mateo – in Silicon Valley. Here is how he predicts the Internet will influence who reads what:

> *I think it's safe to assume that our current elementary students will have access to the Internet 24 hours a day, seven days a week*

from a small, very fast, inexpensive toy they carry in their pocket. I cannot assume that we will be able to block the Internet as kids access it from the playground.

The genie is out of the bottle.

With regard to Butz and his Website using the <nwu.edu> domain name: I do not believe Northwestern is going to deny it to him. I do not believe that those who want to deny it to him will stop trying. Sisyphus.

It's been suggested, more than once, that I produce revisionist "labels" for SR readers and others to stick up on public bulletin boards in their neighborhood and on campus – or wherever your imagination leads.

The Holocaust Question

Ignore the Thought Police.
Read the evidence.
Judge for yourself.

www.codoh.com

I always thought it was a good idea, but in Baja it was difficult to get it done. In Visalia there was nothing to it. I've already done it. The printing is black on a glossy yellow background. There are only fourteen words. They will take the reader to the bigest and best Holocaust revisionist Website on earth. To the place where the information is. The place they need to go.

The illustration above is somewhat reduced to fit in the column. If you would like to use these labels I'll send them along at cost – post paid.

---

10 Labels $1 50 Labels $4
100 or more Labels 7 cents each.
(Post paid)

First I'm going to apologize (forgive me), then I'm going to say it straight out. While I've never looked to the future, the future is here before me. My wife has cancer, our fourteen-year-old daughter is a drug addict, I'm seventy-one years old, I have no money, and I am at a crossroads with regard to the work. Maybe I'm depressed. I'm not the sort who walks about feeling low, so if I am it's probably temporary.

Today I picked Paloma up after school as usual. Driving to the apartment she said: "Dad? This morning when you dropped me off, why were you crying?"

"It was that cassette tape you play so much. The tune keeps going through my mind." It was difficult to talk. I was choking. "'There's No Sunshine When You're Gone.' This morning the tune was in my head, the words were there, and I realized – that's how I feel about you. There's no sunshine...." And then I was choking again.

The last time Paloma disappeared we were still in Baja. That was in January. We had learned that she was using methaphetamines. They call it *crystal* down there or, up here, "crank" or "speed." Maybe she was using other stuff. What does she know? People told us they saw her going into crack houses on dirt roads up in the hills, or, barefoot in the rain, begging for cigarettes. This last time it was nine days before the police called to say she was in jail in Rosarito. A policewoman had recognized her from the handbills we had posted up around town. Paloma had been walking south along the highway from Tijuana. It was almost three in the morning. She was alone.

Alicia and I went to the jail and found her sitting on a bench. Her face looked very bad and she wouldn't talk. We thanked everyone, took her home, put her in our bed and we all went to sleep. I slept on the floor crossways in front of the door so that it could not be opened without waking me.

We got up at mid-morning. Alicia had packed bags for Paloma and me a week earlier. The computers and files were already in the trunk. At one PM we were all across the border at San Yisidro. I said goodbye to Alicia. She looked stricken. And then I began the drive north with Paloma. I didn't know very well where I was going or what I was going to do. I only understood one thing. I had to get my daughter out of Mexico.

So here we are in Visalia, she and I. We sleep on the floor in a largely empty apartment. Her day is structured very tightly. When she's not in school or in group, I don't let her out of my sight. She has not used in about sixty days. She's relaxing. I have set up an office in the bedroom on three folding tables. A friend has loaned me two chairs.' We live a very Spartan life. We don't seem to mind. I have three difficult jobs to take care of: my wife, my daughter and the Project. I do expect to take care of them.

This may be very much more than some of you will have wanted to know. But I owe it to you to tell you enough, the bare minimum, so that you understand at least something about why there has been some disorder in the Project over the last months. Don't give up on me. I intend to go straight ahead with the work.

Bradley

NEW ADDRESS

Smith's Report

is produced by
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)

For your contribution of $29
you will receive eleven issues of
Smith's Report
Canada and Mexico $35
Overseas $39

All checks and correspondence to

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 3296
Visalia, California 93278

Telephone: 559 732 8360

E-mail: CABRSMITH@prodigy.net

On the Internet: www.codoh.com